

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the Application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because of enumerated problems. The Examiner states that in Figure 1 the reference numeral "100" should be inserted. This reference numeral has been added to Figure 1 as has the reference numeral "200" been added to Figure 2. The Examiner states that the reference numeral "518" in Figure 4 is not mentioned in the description. This has been corrected to reference numeral "420" and the specification has been amended to recite this reference numeral. The Examiner states that the reference character "418" in Figure 4 has been used to designate both a power supply input and a switching system. Although that reference numeral was utilized twice in the description, it was only utilized once in Figure 4; the second input being labeled 518 in Figure 4. The specification has been corrected in order to recite the reference numeral "420" for the V_{CC} connection. The Examiner objects to reference numeral "505" in Figure 5, stating that it should be -- 504 --. This reference numeral has been corrected as has the recitation in the box where "I/O" been changed to -- input-- as only the input pins are coupled to V_{CC} MAX.

The Examiner objects to the disclosure because of listed informalities. On Page 4, at lines 29 and 30, the recitations of Q1 and Q2 have been reversed, as requested by the Examiner. On Page 5, at line 21 the reference numeral "400" was changed to -- 300 -- and on Page 7 the recitation of ".for" was replace with -- for --.

The Examiner has objected to the claims because of listed informalities. In claims 1 and 7 the word "IC" has been inserted as requested by the Examiner. In Claim 8, the term "IC" has been inserted and the word -- pin -- inserted after "input" as requested by the Examiner. In Claim 11 at line 8 the term "source" was replaced with -- pulse -- and the term "the power supply" was replace with -- the means for supplying a maximum supply voltage --. In view of the later change, Applicant's also amended the recitation "means for supply" on line 9 to add the words -- a maximum supply voltage --

for conformity. Furthermore, the word “conditioning” on line 10 has been changed to -- condition --, which is the correct term. In Claim 12, on lines 3 and 5, the term “power supply” has been changed to -- means for supplying a maximum supply voltage --. In Claim 13, the “means for determining an increase in current from the power supply” was changed to -- the means for determining a latch up condition --, which differs from the Examiner’s word “conditioning” as explained above. The term “the power supply” on lines 3 and 4 was changed to – the means for supplying a maximum supply voltage --.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-7, 11-13, 15-17 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Salcedo-Suner. The Examiner states that this reference discloses all of the features of the present invention and specifically mentions an overvoltage source 502 operative to apply an overvoltage pulse (V_{TRIGGER}).

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The patent was issued to the same Inventor as the present application. The Inventor has discovered that utilizing current pulses to test the devices only detects a portion of the parasitic SCRs within an integrated circuit. Referring to the cited reference at column 3, lines 40-50 we see that the strike pulse is a current injection pulse which may be provided, for example, by a current source. Then at column 4, lines 30, 31, the trigger pulse current is applied to a desired test pin. Thus, the similarities in the figures notwithstanding, the cited reference applies a current pulse whereas the present invention applies an overvoltage pulse. The Inventor has found that parasitic SCRs that are not detected by the current pulse technique can be found by the overvoltage pulse technique, so that it is desirable to do both techniques in order to find these parasitic SCRs. Claim 1 recites “that overvoltage source operative to apply an overvoltage pulse” as does Claim 8. Claim 11 recites a “means for generating an overvoltage pulse” and Claim 15 recites “applying an overvoltage pulse to the test pin”. Accordingly, all of these claims are clearly distinguished from the cited reference.

The Examiner has found that claims 8-10 are allowed over the art of record and that claims 2, 14 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

For the above stated reasons, Applicants believe that all of the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

By 

William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
(972) 917-5452